

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The cross-hatching (double lines) objected to by the Examiner in FIGS. 2, 2A, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 11 has been corrected and replacement drawing sheets, with the correct cross-hatching, are being submitted with this Amendment Response. Additionally, a replacement sheet for FIGS. 13 and 14 is included so as to add the necessary cross-hatching to all component parts.

Amendment Response  
Serial No. 10/728,026 Group Art Unit 3679  
Atty. Docket No. 4098-6  
Page 3 of 9

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested.

The most recent Office Action indicates that claims 1-4, 9, 10 and 12 are rejected and that claims 13 and 14 are objected to. The Examiner has indicated that if claims 13 and 14 are rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, these two claims would be allowed. In view of the fact that claim 14 depends from claim 13, it is believed that the only rewrite necessary for allowance is with respect to claim 13.

In the foregoing Amendment Response, claim 1 has been amended so as to include as part of that claim the language of claim 13. Since there are or were no intervening claims, this amendment is believed to put the subject matter of claim 13 in condition for allowance, now as amended claim 1. Claim 14 has been amended so as to depend from newly amended claim 1. The allowable subject matter of claim 13 that is now introduced into claim 1 has also been incorporated into new claim 15. Since the structure corresponding to this patentable subject matter can be utilized as part of differently styled object holding devices, claim 15 presents claim coverage of varying scope to which the Applicant is entitled. Since the Examiner's basis for patentability of amended claim 1 is the added subject matter from claim 13, retaining that claim 13 subject matter in new claim 15 would similarly provide a basis for patentability. This is why claim 15 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

With regard to the other rejections, claims 1-4, 9, 10, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hagman (U.S. Patent No. 5,738,344).

Amendment Response  
Serial No. 10/728,026 Group Art Unit 3679  
Atty. Docket No. 4098-6  
Page 7 of 9

Considering the amending change to claim 1, and noting that claim 1 is the only independent claim in this application, the amending change is believed to make all other depending claims allowable. Although claim 13 has now been canceled due to its inclusion in claim 1, and while claim 14 has been amended in terms of its claim dependency, all other claims remain as previously presented, nothing that claim 15 has been added.

With regard to some of the various informalities raised by the Examiner, replacement drawing sheets are being provided so as to correct the cross-hatching in FIGS. 2, 2A, 4-9, and 11. Additionally, a replacement sheet for FIGS. 13 and 14 is provided, noting that all elements are now cross-hatched, as requested by the Examiner. In terms of the terminology issues raised by the Examiner, in part directed to the drawings and in part directed to the specification, including claim 1, the Examiner's concerns may be misplaced. First of all, an applicant is not required to use identical or *verbatim* terminology in claims consistent with terminology used within the specification so long as a clear understanding would be provided to a person of ordinary skill in the art. The focus of the Examiner's concerns seems to be directed to an ability to identify what component parts constitute the object mounting assembly, the base subassembly, the support assembly, and the cover portion. Applicant contends that the specification, drawings, and claims are consistent with one another and would be readily understood by a person of ordinary skill in the art considering the functional understanding to be provided to the described assemblies, subassemblies, and components. Even though some of the specific terminology was not used in the specification, the overall understanding of the claimed invention is clearly not deficient nor compromised.


Amendment Response  
Serial No. 10/728,026 Group Art Unit 3679  
Atty. Docket No. 4098-6  
Page 8 of 9

The object mounting assembly includes a combination of components 85, 86, 88, 89, 91, 91a, 91b, 92, and 93. The base subassembly portion of the object mounting assembly includes components 85, 86, and 91a. The support assembly includes components 72, 74, 76, and 81. The cover portion is component 80. In order to try and address the Examiner's concerns, page 12 of the specification has been amended so as to incorporate terminology such as "mounting assembly" and "base subassembly".

Based upon the information provided herein, and considering the amending changes to page 12 of the specification, it is Applicant's belief that all of the Examiner's concerns in this regard have been appropriately addressed. Further, an amending change has been made to the Abstract so that it is now consistent with the elected species.

Having addressed all of the issues raised in the Office Action, and making appropriate amendments to the claims consistent with the Examiner's indication of allowability, the subject patent application is believed to be in condition for allowance and is respectfully requested to be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

By   
James M. Durlacher, Reg. No. 28,840  
Woodard, Emhardt, Moriarty,  
McNett & Henry LLP  
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5137  
(317) 634-3456

Amendment Response  
Serial No. 10/728,026 Group Art Unit 3679  
Atty. Docket No. 4098-6  
Page 9 of 9